1	BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION			
2	COMMISSIONERS			
3	MARC SPITZER, Chairman WILLIAM A. MUNDELL			
5	JEFF HATCH-MILLER MIKE GLEASON KRISTIN K. MAYES			
6	In the matter of:) DOCKET NO. S-03566A-04-0000			
7 8 9	NOEL EUGENE CULLISON and BARBARA CULLISON, husband and wife, 3108 East Siesta Lane Phoenix, AZ 85050 ONOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING REGARDING PROPOSED ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST, ORDER FOR RESTITUTION, FOR			
10 11) ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTIES AND SOLUTIONS, SOURCES, & CONSULTING, LLC 3108 East Siesta Lane) Phoenix, AZ 85050)			
12 13	ENERGY SAVINGS SOLUTION, INC.) 3108 East Siesta Lane) Phoenix, AZ 85050)			
14	Respondents.			
15	NOTICE: EACH RESPONDENT HAS 10 DAYS TO REQUEST A HEARING			
16	EACH RESPONDENT HAS 30 DAYS TO FILE AN ANSWER			
17	The Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona Corporation Commission			
18	("Commission") alleges that Respondents have engaged in acts, practices and transactions, which			
19	constitute violations of the Securities Act of Arizona, A.R.S. § 44-1801 et seq. ("Securities Act").			
20	I.			
21	JURISDICTION			
22	1. The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Article XV of the			
23	Arizona Constitution, and the Securities Act.			
24				
25				
26				

1	II.			
2	RESPONDENTS			
3	2. Respondent Noel Eugene Cullison resides at 3108 East Siesta Lane, Phoenix, AZ			
4	85050.			
5	3. Respondent Solution, Sources, and Consulting, LLC ("SSC") is an Arizona limited			
6	liability company, located at 3108 East Siesta Lane, Phoenix, AZ 85050. Cullison formed SSC and			
7	is a member of it.			
8	4. Respondent Energy Savings Solution, Inc. ("ESS") is an Arizona corporation,			
9	located at 3108 East Siesta Lane, Phoenix, AZ 85050. Cullison is ESS's president, secretary and			
10	treasurer. The Commission administratively dissolved ESS on July 6, 2004, for failure to file its			
11	annual report.			
12	5. Barbara Cullison was at all relevant times the spouse of Cullison. Barbara Cullison			
13	is joined in this action under A.R.S. § 44-2031(C) solely for purposes of determining the liability			
14	of the marital community.			
15	6. At all times relevant, Cullison was acting for his own benefit, and for the benefit or			
16	in furtherance of the marital community.			
17	7. Cullison, SSC and ESS may be collectively referred to as "Respondents." Barbara			
18	Cullison may be referred to as Respondent Spouse.			
19	m.			
20	FACTS			
21	8. Beginning in 1994, Respondents offered stock, promissory notes or investment			
22	contracts to investors. Respondents raised at least \$1,700,000 from at least 16 investors, most of			
23	whom are Arizona residents.			
24				
25				
26				
	2			

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16 17 18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

9. Cullison was an Arizona licensed insurance agent for Northwest Mutual Life Insurance Company ("Northwestern Mutual") until July 2001 when he failed to renew his license. Most of the investors were clients of Northwestern Mutual and Cullison.

- 10. Cullison offered several investment opportunities to the investors. With one investment, he told investors that he had a personal investment account at Northwestern Mutual that paid 8.8%. He told investors that if they provided him funds, he would place their funds in his account and pay them that interest. Those investors who accepted this opportunity received a promissory note signed by Cullison for the amount invested. Cullison did not provide any documents to investors regarding the alleged account at Northwestern Mutual. In fact, Cullison had no such account at Northwestern Mutual in which he could place investor funds.
- Cullison told other investors that his company, SSC, had contracts to provide ice machines to U.S. Navy ships in San Diego, California. He told investors that SSC would use the funds as capital for the company, to build facilities to service the contracts or to purchase the machines to be sold to the Navy. Upon information and belief, SSC had no contracts to provide any equipment or services to the Navy.
- Cullison solicited other investors with an investment opportunity in ESS. He told them that ESS, which he owned, was marketing a product which would prevent power surges in electrical current to buildings. Cullison offered stock in ESS to prospective investors. At least one investor received a letter confirming that he owned a percentage of the company, although no shares were issued to him. Other investors in ESS received notes signed by Cullison.
- Cullison told other investors that he had the opportunity to broker the sale of a group of nursing homes in the Midwest. He informed the investors that he would receive a fee upon the completion of the transaction. He told them that he would use to money from investors to fund expenses incurred in attempting to arrange the sale.

	14.	Some of the investors, at Cullison's suggestion, took money out of Northwestern		
Mutua	l life ins	surance policies that they owned to invest with Respondents. At least some of the		
investors did not realize that they were borrowing money from their insurance policy and would				
be cha	rged int	erest by Northwestern Mutual for their policy loans.		

- 15. Most investors received notes from Respondents, or confirmation from Respondents that they owned part of SSC or ESS, although those investors did not receive stock certificates
- 16. Respondents did not provide any of the investors with prospectuses, financial statements or other documents disclosing risk.
- 17. Respondents did not inform investors that other than limited income in 2000, SSC had no income in 2001 or 2002 and that ESS had no income.
- 18. For those investors who received notes from Respondents, Respondents offered interest rates ranging from 6% to 24%.
- 19. Investor funds for all the different investments were deposited in Cullison's personal account. Interest was paid to some investors from income Cullison earned in his insurance business, from investors' own principal or from additional investor funds.
- 20. Much of the money raised by Respondents from all investors was used for Cullison's personal living expenses. Investors had not consented to allow Cullison to use their investments for such expenses.
- 21. Certain investors complained or brought suit against Northwestern Mutual, alleging its responsibility for the actions of Cullison. Northwestern Mutual has settled many of these complaints and lawsuits, paying investors some of the amounts lost due to the actions of Respondents.

IV.

VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1841 1 (Offer or Sale of Unregistered Securities) 2 3 22. From on or about 1994, Respondents offered or sold securities in the form of stock, notes and investment contracts within or from Arizona. 4 5 23. The securities referred to above were not registered pursuant to the provisions of Articles 6 or 7 of the Securities Act. 6 7 24. This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1841. 8 V. 9 VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1842 10 (Transactions by Unregistered Dealers or Salesmen) 11 12 25. Respondents offered or sold securities within or from Arizona, while not registered 13 as dealers or salesmen pursuant to the provisions of Article 9 of the Securities Act. 26. This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1842. 14 VI. 15 **VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1991** 16 (Fraud in Connection with the Offer or Sale of Securities) 17 27. 18 In connection with the offer or sale of securities within or from Arizona, Respondents directly or indirectly: (i) employed a device, scheme or artifice to defraud; (ii) made 19 20 untrue statements of material fact or omitted to state material facts which were necessary in order to make the statements made not misleading in light of the circumstances under which they were 21 made; and (iii) engaged in transactions, practices or courses of business which operated or would 22 23 operate as a fraud or deceit upon offerees and investors. Respondents' conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following: 24 25 26

The Division requests that the Commission grant the following relief against Respondents:

Order Respondents to permanently cease and desist from violating the Securities Act, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032;

25 26

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

7 8 9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

> 22 23

24 25

26

2. Order Respondents to take affirmative action to correct the conditions resulting from their acts, practices or transactions, including a requirement to make restitution pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032;

- 3. Order Respondents to pay the state of Arizona administrative penalties of up to five thousand dollars (\$5,000) for each violation of the Securities Act, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2036;
- 4. Order that the marital community of Noel and Barbara Cullison be subject to any order of restitution, rescission, administrative penalties, or other appropriate affirmative action pursuant to A.R.S. § 25-215; and
 - Order any other relief that the Commission deems appropriate.

VIII.

HEARING OPPORTUNITY

Respondents, including Respondent Spouse, may request a hearing pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-1972 and A.A.C. R14-4-306. If any Respondent requests a hearing, the Respondent must also answer this Notice. A request for hearing must be in writing and received by the Commission within 10 business days after service of this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing. Each Respondent must deliver or mail the request to Docket Control, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007. A Docket Control cover sheet must accompany the request. A cover sheet form and instructions may be obtained from Docket Control by calling (602) 542-3477 or on the Commission's Internet web site at www.cc.state.az.us/utility/forms/index.htm.

If a request for a hearing is timely made, the Commission shall schedule the hearing to begin 20 to 60 days from the receipt of the request unless otherwise provided by law, stipulated by the parties, or ordered by the Commission. If a request for a hearing is not timely made, the

.

Commission may, without a hearing, enter an order against each Respondent granting the relief requested by the Division in this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing.

Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation such as a sign language interpreter, as well as request this document in an alternative format, by contacting Yvonne L. McFarlin, Executive Assistant to the Executive Secretary, voice phone number 602/542-3931, e-mail ymcfarlin@cc.state.az.us. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

IX.

ANSWER REQUIREMENT

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-305, if any Respondent or Respondent Spouse requests a hearing, Respondent or Respondent Spouse must deliver or mail an Answer to this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing to Docket Control, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007, within 30 calendar days after the date of service of this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing. A Docket Control cover sheet must accompany the Answer. A cover sheet form and instructions may be obtained from Docket Control by calling (602) 542-3477 or on the Commission's Internet web site at www.cc.state.az.us/utility/forms/index.htm.

Additionally, Respondent or Respondent Spouse must serve the Answer upon the Division. Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-303, service upon the Division may be made by mailing or by hand-delivering a copy of the Answer to the Division at 1300 West Washington, 3^d Floor, Phoenix, Arizona, 85007, addressed to Mark Dinell.

The Answer shall contain an admission or denial of each allegation in this Notice and the original signature of each Respondent, Respondent Spouse or Respondent's attorney. A statement of a lack of sufficient knowledge or information shall be considered a denial of an allegation. An allegation not denied shall be considered admitted.

When Respondent or Respondent Spouse intends in good faith to deny only a part or a qualification of an allegation, Respondent or Respondent Spouse shall specify that part or qualification of the allegation and shall admit the remainder. Respondent or Respondent Spouse waives any affirmative defense not raised in the answer.

The officer presiding over the hearing may grant relief from the requirement to file an Answer for good cause shown. Dated this <u>30th</u> day of September, 2004. /s/ Phillip Hofling Phillip Hofling Assistant Director of Securities